

# THE MAIN STAGES AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF THE MECHANISM OF STATE POWER IN THE RUSSIAN SOCIOLOGICAL, POLITICAL AND LEGAL SCIENCE<sup>7</sup>

Aleksey Yurkovsky.;  
Igor A. Kuzmin;  
Elena S. Kuzmina

## Abstract

*The article aims to draw attention to the relevance of the study of the phenomenology of state power, its mechanisms, and their external and internal characteristics, patterns of existence, transformation and modernization. The proposed study is an attempt to form a logically consistent view of the evolution of the scientific concept of the mechanism of state power from the point of view of interdisciplinary discourse in relation to the object of study, taking into account the methodological specifics of the provisions of Russian sociological, political and legal science. For a more inclusive and in-depth introduction to the problem, we turn to the historical processes of formation of the legal worldview in relation to our issue.*

## Introduction.

State building in modern states requires proper theoretical and methodological support in the context of a unified and consistent perception of the content of the basic categories that underlie the corresponding transformation processes. The construction of a system of public authorities, the distribution of powers (delineation of competence) between them, assigning them to one or another branch of government, determining the criteria and subjects of delegation of authority, as well as much more, should be based on an adequate understanding of the category of “government mechanism”.

In the scientific and cognitive legal discourse, one can find a position according to which the attitude to the category “mechanism of state power” is finally formed. However, with closer attention to the definitive description of this category, its controversial clarification is determined, predetermined by the types of outlook of researchers, their specific research interests and goals.

---

<sup>7</sup> Received 11.09.2019; accepted 16.012020; DOI: 10.1043/mester/49.2020.1.7

This study is an attempt to form an interdisciplinary view of the object of our attention by incorporating the provisions of Russian sociological, political and legal science into the methodology involved. For a more inclusive and in-depth introduction to the problems, we turn to the historical processes of the formation of a legal worldview in relation to our issue.

## DEVELOPMENT.

### Research methodology.

Theoretical and methodological provisions include the works of foreign and Russian scientists in the field of theory of state and law, constitutional law, sociology, political science and related subject areas based on the results of fundamental and applied research in the field of nature and the mechanism of state power.

Focusing on the principles of objectivity, pluralism, comprehensiveness and historicism, the authors used a range of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, deduction, induction, extrapolation, etc.), special (sociological, historical, political, etc.) and private (formal-legal, systematic -legal and other) research methods.

### Study results.

The genesis of the formation of the category of mechanism of state power, in our opinion, should be divided into five key stages, each of which can be characterized by its own choice of methodological tools and research priorities:

Monarchical (pre-revolutionary), divided into independent stages (early, middle, late - crisis).

Revolutionary (transitional).

Soviet, divided into three stages: early Soviet (Leninist), Central Soviet (Stalin), late Soviet (revisionist).

Pre-perestroika (convergence).

Modern post-Marxist (pluralistic).

The first stage is associated with the formation of ideas about state power in general.

The first stage is associated with the formation of ideas about state power in general, an assessment of its social nature and purpose, a description of the structure and functions.

This stage of the evolution of ideas about the formation of a category of state power mechanism has the most ancient history and is associated with various interpretations of history in political and state-legal thought. It is advisable to recall that the category under study does not imply a consideration of the phenomenology of power in general and state power in particular.

Obviously, the category of the mechanism of state power is narrower in relation to the category of state power, and involves the perception of the latter through the prism of structural and functional analysis. Therefore, in our opinion, the emergence of the category of mechanism of state power is

associated only with the period of the emergence of the modern sociological school of state law research.

The question of the historiography of foreign studies of the category of mechanism of state power is the subject of a separate study and requires independent consideration. We hypothesize that the prerequisites for an intuitive synthesis of the category of mechanism of state power were formed in domestic state-legal science in the middle of the 19th century.

The first stage in the evolution of ideas about the formation of a category of the mechanism of state power includes the following groups of scientific approaches: theological, psychoanalytic, historical, sociological, and class.

Attentive attitude to the work of pre-revolutionary scientists of state studies provides the need for historical, axiological, estological and constitutional analysis of the development of basic scientific approaches to understanding the essence of the mechanism of state power, its significance for the development of society and the state.

Among the “conservative” theories of the understanding of state power and its mechanism in the pre-revolutionary period in the 18th – early 20th centuries that dominate in Russian official social and legal science, the works of ideologists of the monarchist state-legal policy and its supporters include: A. S. Alekseev, G.V. Vernadsky, B.P. Vysheslavitsev, M.F. Vladimirsky-Budanov, V.M. Hessen, A.D. Gradovsky, P.E. Kazansky, B.A. Kistjakovsky, S.A. Kotlyarevsky, G.K. Kotoshikhin, N.M. Korkunov, HH Lazarevsky, Ya. M. Magaziner, B.E. Nolde, P. B. Struve, L. A. Tikhomi s, E. H. Trubetskoy, S. Frank, BNTchitcherin, VG Sheglov and others.

The ideas about the mechanism of state power in the writings of the scientists listed above were mainly linked with the corresponding historical stage, with a legal analysis of the activities of individual bodies of the highest state power.

In our opinion, the monarchical stage of the evolution of scientific ideas can be divided into three independent stages:

The stage of early, monarchical ideas about the mechanism of state power, in our opinion, is connected with theological and clerical political and legal doctrines and can date back to the 9th - mid 17th centuries.

The middle monarchical stage of the formation of ideas about the nature and content of state power, the forms of its manifestation and its influence on social relations with the aim

of establishing and maintaining the proposed order is connected with philosophical and religious concepts of the mid-17th - early 19th centuries. At this stage, the formation of scientific and theoretical ideas about the state and power.

The ideas of Russian scientists about the signs of the mechanism of state power were influenced to one degree or another by philosophical concepts, mainly by Western researchers. Stating this thesis, we only determine the geography of priorities, and the orientation of domestic scientists on the samples of Western, rather than Eastern, state-legal thought. At the same time, we postulate the thesis of the serious contribution that domestic authors made to the development of the construction of the mechanism of state power. In this regard, we consider it appropriate to refer to the opinion of

A. Isaev that the views of Russian jurists were developed in the course of criticism of the concepts of leading European lawyers of that time (mainly French and German): A. Affolter, O. Girke, L. Dugi, G. Jellinek, G. Kelsen, O. Meyer, M. Oriu, V. Orlando and others.

As a result, the Russian doctrine of law developed the concept of the state, state body and state power in the form of a norm (system of norms) regulating their activities as subjects of law or legal relations (the latter was especially insisted by N. M. Korkunov). Before the revolution itself, the two concepts noted above represented the main trends in Russian constitutional science [1].

The third late (crisis) monarchical stage of research is connected with the historical development of the effectiveness of the monarchical form of government and the monarchical type of

government mechanism in Russia, which can be considered as a stage in the formation of a truly scientific method for assessing form, essence, content, structure and system mechanism of state power, as well as its main functions. This period dates from the late XIX - early XX centuries. Politicians, practicing lawyers and scientists, experts in the field of philosophy, political science, sociology and jurisprudence are beginning to actively apply the scientific and rational way of knowing the subject in question.

Each of the stages of the first stage is associated with the application of consonant, consistent political doctrines of the development of Russian statehood, offering various hypotheses for understanding the mechanism of state power, and practice-oriented proposals for solving pressing state problems, the interaction of public authorities and people. Special attention was paid to relations between Russia, the West and the East.

It is worth noting that the scientific ideas of the supporters of conservative pre-revolutionary theories were intended to ensure imperial sovereignty, preserve the historical traditions of statehood, the prevailing form of government, state structure and political regime. Conservative scientific doctrines were based on the accumulated experience of the relationship between state power and the people, its various institutions, the level of legal culture and the nature of the legal consciousness of the population, which corresponded to a certain historical situation and many other factors.

In the works of the pro-monarchist representatives of state legal science, a holistic view of the main features, the structure of the mechanism of state power is usually not given. Nevertheless, in the scientific studies of the historical stage under consideration, there is an analysis of the experience of optimizing the structure of the highest state power and the legal norms regulating its activity, which in itself indicates the existence of a specific methodological approach to state power.

The concepts of a conservative approach to understanding state power and its mechanism are based on the majority of scholars of the 18th - early 20th centuries. considered the principle of collegiality as a starting methodological position.

Supporters of the Slavophil current in a conservative approach to the functional characterization of state power (Slavophiles, or Slavophiles) formulated the thesis that Russia needs its own, distinctive path of historical development. Among the supporters of this concept include the research of such scientists as I.S. Aksakova, K.S. Aksakova, A.I. Koshelev, I.V. Kireevsky, Yu.F. Samarin, F.V. Chizhov, and others.

A special direction of the scientific justification of the monarchical doctrine of the functioning of the mechanism of state power, in our opinion, is a coalition of private scientific theories that directly radicalized the political regime that prevailed at that time and in 1905-1907 that formed the Black Hundred social and political movement. Moreover, it should be noted that the term "black hundred" itself came into widespread use at the very beginning of the twentieth century and united ultra-right politicians. In the Small explanatory dictionary of the Russian language of Peter Stoyan (1913), the Black Hundred, or Black Hundred, was defined as a Russian monarchist, conservative and ally.

One of the founders of the radical representatives of conservative state-legal thought was V. A. Gringmut, a Russian political figure, historian, publicist, current state adviser, member of the Russian Assembly, founder of the Russian monarchist party, one of the main ideologists of the Black-Hundred movement in tsarist Russia, editor-in-chief newspapers "Moscow News".

After the manifestos of Nicholas II of February 18, 1905, "On the elections to the Duma" and "To the Russian people," V. A. Gringmouth appealed to support the autocracy and put forward the idea of creating a right-wing monarchy [2]. The first Black-Hundred party in the history of Russia advocated an unlimited monarchy and denied any concessions to parliamentarism.

According to V. A. Gringmouth, the Black Hundreds strive "to restore a powerful, united, indivisible Russia and restore its formidable land and sea power; to ensure that Russia is governed by the Unlimited Autocratic Sovereign, and that the Tsar is not separated from the people by officials or Duma; so that the internal order and comprehensive, free development of state and popular forces are strictly protected by solid laws, for the complete well-being of Russia and in accordance with its centuries-old historical foundation" [3].

V. A. Gringmouth even opposed the zemstvos, proposing to replace them with the power of the district leaders of the nobility, with representatives from the estates attached

to them for the meeting, he advocated the concept of "Moscow - the Third Rome" [4], believing that in Russia "Roman autocracy, Byzantine Orthodoxy and the Russian nationality are united into one harmonious, indissoluble whole" [5].

The power, according to V. A. Gringmouth, will rest in the hands of Russia, firmly and indestructibly established in both halves of its empire and turned them into one great, not European and not Asian, but Orthodox, autocratic, Russian whole with a rich, peculiar and diverse culture" [6].

It should be especially noted that V. A. Gringmouth was a principled opponent of terror as a method of struggle [7], addressed members of the Black-Hundred organizations with an appeal: "Never dare about this (about political murder) and think, remember that anyone who fights for a famous idea, he will never kill, otherwise he will sign that he does not believe in the triumph of his idea. A truly viable, truly holy idea can only be irrigated by the blood of its adherents. Each new victim from our ranks brings us closer to victory, but let it be a shame to anyone who thinks to raise a fratricidal hand against his enemy: by doing so he will put a shameful stain on our holy cause! Peacefully, covering it with our corpses and not a single iota conceding from our beliefs, we will reach our goal, we will win" [8].

Among the representatives of the Black-Hundred state-legal doctrine, one can also distinguish such figures as A. I. Dubrovin, N. E. Markov, V. M. Purishkevich and others.

Representations of supporters of the liberal current of state legal thought, whose ideas differed from the official concept of state power, but whose views were present in the scientific discourse during the existence of Russian statehood in the XVIII - early XX centuries. were widely developed. To the category of scientific theories that were allowed before public discussion and experimental use in the pre-revolutionary period of the existence of Russian statehood in the XVIII - early XX centuries. include the works of such scientists as A. S. Alekseev, I. E. Andreevsky, F. F. Kokoshkin,

M. Korkunov, N. I. Lazarevsky, S. A. Muromtsev and some others.

#### The second, revolutionary (transitional) stage

The second, revolutionary (transitional) stage of the doctrinal concepts of the mechanism of state power is closely connected with the ascent and dynamic spread of the Marxist-Leninist state-right doctrine. K. Marx and F. Engels in the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" showed that public power is the function of managing society, specifying that "When class differences disappear during development and all production is concentrated in the hands of an association of individuals, then public power will lose its political character" [9]. Marxist theory, which laid the methodological foundation for determining the functional characteristics of the mechanism of state power, is reflected in a number of publications by K. Marx and F. Engels [10]. I. A. Fedorov, considering the

historiography of scientific communism, studied this issue in detail [11]. It is in the works of K. Marx, F. Engels, and after them, V.I. (Ulyanov) Lenin, that the functional features of state power are compared as a system - a mechanism.

We believe that it is appropriate to refer to the opinion of S. V. Leonov that Soviet historiography has accumulated enormous factual material, but was categorically built on Leninist provisions on the "breakdown" of the bourgeois state machine, on the creation of a "working" state in the form of

a "republic of Soviets", which represented a fundamentally new and qualitatively higher type of statehood and democracy and so on. These "minted" Leninist formulas were fully established in historical literature and were at least partially supported factually only about half a century after the October Revolution [12, p. 48].

It should be noted that among the representatives of the Marxist concept of the formation of the mechanism of state power, there was never a harmonious unity of opinion, which subsequently affected the formation of ideological trends in world scientific thought. Therefore, the first lines of interpretation of the Marxist concept can be divided into four groups: moderate Marxists (revisionists), centrist Marxists, radical Marxists, ultraradical Marxists.

The "moderate" Marxists are mainly represented by the "revisionists" led by E. Bernstein [13], who argued that history does not lead to a widening gap between the tycoons of capitalism and the proletariat, but to its filling. The expectation of a cataclysm [breakdown] is baseless and should be replaced by a belief in a gradual evolution leading to the socialization of the social system (through municipalization). The revisionists believed that overcoming capitalism and replacing it with the first phase of communism — socialism — would be the result of the evolution of capitalism, and the proletarian revolution is not necessary here.

A prominent "centrist" of Marxism is recognized by K. Kautsky [14], who owns a number of historical and sociological works in the spirit of historical and economic materialism, which were talentedly written and based on the serious methodological approach of the ideas contained in the works: "Thomas More und seine Utopie" ("Thomas More and his Utopia", Stuttgart, 1888); Die Klassengegensätze von 1789 (Stuttgart, 1889); in the 1st volume "Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung in Einzeldarstellungen" (Stuttgart, 1894), ed. edited by Kautsky and Bernstein, - the history of socialism from Plato to Thomas More; "TO. Marx oekonomische Lehren gemeinverständlich dargestellt u. erläutert").

In the years 1903-1917, G. V. Plekhanov is opposed to the Leninist policy of an immediate socialist revolution in Russia. On the other hand, G. V. Plekhanov is a militant materialist-Marxist fighting against "bourgeois idealistic" philosophy. The Marxist centrists believed that it was necessary to wage a political struggle for democracy, to alleviate the position of the working class, to create the economic and cultural prerequisites of socialism, but not to carry out the proletarian revolution until the necessary conditions were formed in society. The working class is not yet cultured enough to be able to take

control of the country and production. The economy is not yet sufficiently centralized by capitalism so that it can be managed from a single center.

Radical Marxists (for example, V.I. Lenin) believed that the prerequisites of the proletarian revolution may arise earlier than the prerequisites of socialism, but it is still necessary to fight for it. In the works of V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", "Friedrich Engels", "Three Sources and Three Components of Marxism", "Historical Fates of the Teachings of Karl Marx", in the Abstract of the book of the Marx and Engels "The Holy Family" and other works were the foundations of a dialectical materialist (in fact, specific methodological) study of the formation and development of a communist worldview have been laid.

The deepest penetration into the essence of Marxism, its creative development in new historical conditions, allowed V.I. Lenin to outline the main stages of the transition of K. Marx and F. Engels from idealism and revolutionary democracy to materialism and scientific communism, to reveal the dialectics of the movement and its key points.

So, V.I. Lenin not only made a decisive step in studying the formation of Marxism, but also outlined a program for further research in this area. He has published many works of a very different genre on issues of politics, power, and the state. For the topic of our discussion, the most significant of them are: "What to do?" (1902), "Imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism" (1916), "State and revolution. The doctrine of Marxism about the state and the tasks of the

proletariat in revolution" (1917), "Proletarian revolution and renegade Kautsky" (1918), "Children's disease of "leftism" in communism" (1920).

The most striking supporter of ultra-radical Marxists is L.D. Trotsky, who in 1905 formulated a theory that became known as the theory of permanent revolution. This "Trotskyist" concept is fundamentally different from other trends that lead their political genealogy from Marxism. One of the most important elements of the theory of "permanent revolution" is the theory of combined development.

Until the beginning of the 20th century, Marxists considered the possibility of a socialist revolution only in the developed capitalist countries. According to L.D. Trotsky, in relatively developed countries such as Russia (where the process of industrialization and development of the proletariat had just begun) it would be possible to carry out a socialist revolution due to the historically predetermined inability of the bourgeoisie to fulfill bourgeois-democratic demands.

The third, Soviet stage in the formation of ideas about the category of state power mechanism. Soviet historiography has accumulated a wealth of factual material, but was rigidly built on Leninist principles about the "breaking down" of the bourgeois state machine, about creating a "working" state in the form of the "Republic of Soviets" [15, p. 88-91,114,115,154. T.31. S. 162,163], which was a fundamentally new and qualitatively higher type of statehood and democracy. It is noteworthy that these "minted" Leninist



formulas were fully established in historical literature and were partially supported by the factual foundation only after about half a century [16, p. 48] after the October Revolution.

This circumstance is confirmed by a number of “early” works by N. N. Baturlin, M. F. Vladimirsky,

V. N. Durdenevsky, M. Ya. Latsis, G. S. Mikhailov, V. I. Nevsky, B. D. Pletnev , O. A. Pyatnitsky and many others. Unfortunately, the current socio-political situation in the state and widespread criticism of “early scientific research” in the 50-60s. XX century led to the fact that unique factual material and interesting methodological positions found in the "revolutionary" literature, published until the mid30-ies. XX century. In many respects were unclaimed by subsequent Soviet historiography. The “early” works were blamed on a narrow source base, as well as many errors of a “factual and fundamental nature”, poor coverage of the role of the Communist Party in state building, insufficient consideration of the “word” processes of the old state apparatus and much more [17, p. four].

The period from the mid-30s to the mid-50s.

The 20th century in historiography was marked by an unprecedented ideological dictate and the curtailment of the scientific development of plots related to the genesis of Soviet statehood. A timid, mostly schematic, study of the relevant issues was carried out mainly in the form of dissertation research (of all the dissertations devoted to the October Revolution, only 13% mentioned the problems of creating the Soviet state apparatus and its elements - the Provisional Government, Soviets, etc.). At the turn of the 40-50s. signs of “revitalization” are noted in science, as can be seen from the works of M. I. Barsukov (The Great October Socialist Revolution and the organization of Soviet health care: October 1917 - July 1918 - 1951), E. I. Pesikina (People’s Commissariat for Affairs nationalities and its activities in 1917–1918 - 1950), D. A. Chugaev (First Constitution of the Soviet State - 1941) and others.

In the 70s - the first half of the 80s. XX century, the number of studies affecting the formation of Soviet statehood, has grown significantly. New large monographs of M. P. Iroshnikov were published, which examined the activities of V. I. Lenin as chairman of the Soviet government, cited data on the composition of the Soviet apparatus, obtained on the basis of an analysis of the respective censuses; EG Gimpelson - on the formation of a system of economic management and attracting workers to management, and many other works that reveal the features of the formation of a system of dictatorship of the proletariat in Soviet Russia, the activities of the Soviets, the

adoption of the Constitution of 1918, military construction, as well as the history of the Constituent Assembly, some other non-Soviet authorities and "non-proletarian" parties V. T. Agalakov, N. M. Aleschenko, E. Ya. Andreyenko, G. A. Gerasimenko, A. P. Gogolevsky, A. I. Denisov, G. I. Zakazov, T. D. Ionkina, V. P. Portnov, M. M. Slavin, Yu. S. Tokarev, S. S. Khesin, O. I. Chistyakov and others.

In addition, we note that studies of Soviet concepts of the mechanism of state power, in many respects depended on the interpretation of Marxist ideology and especially its official interpretation by the highest party bodies and leaders of the communist party.

The fourth pre-perestroika (convergence) stage is connected with the revisionism of Marxism and the figure of A.N. Yakovlev, who is traditionally regarded as one of the intellectual leaders who modernized the transformation of the dominance of Marxist ideology in the USSR, for which the titles of "architect" were entrenched in political and journalistic circles perestroika "and" father of publicity ". The conditional historical period of this stage: the 90s. XX century

A. N. Yakovlev worked in the Presidential Commission for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression. A. N. Yakovlev published over 25 monographic works translated into different languages of the world. After the beginning of perestroika in the USSR, he published books "Realism - the Land of Perestroika", "The Pangs of Reading Being" and "Preface. The collapse. Afterword", "The Bitter Chalice", "According to the relics and fir trees", "Comprehension", "Krestosev".

A number of events are associated with the activities of A. N. Yakovlev, which influenced the course of political modernization in the USSR. In particular, in 1969–1972. A. N. Yakovlev was indirectly involved in the creation of the Club of Rome.

The second significant figure of the pre-perestroika stage is S. S. Shatalin, in whose works an economic justification for the convergence of socialist and capitalist socio-economic systems was proposed ("The Functioning of the Economy of Developed Socialism", "Economic Reform:

Causes, Directions, Problems"). In fact, the researcher created the theory of the evolutionary development of capitalism and socialism in the direction of their convergence. The meaning of this theory is to abandon the opposition of the plan and the market: the economy is treated as a complex hierarchical system that can successfully develop only on the basis of a combination of horizontal and vertical connections.

S. Shatalin, recognizing the need for major shifts in the reproductive structure of the Soviet economy, assigned a major role to a major maneuver of resources in favor of consumer sectors and social services. He translated the theoretical struggle against dogmatism of the era of Soviet industrialization with its "law of the outstripping growth of the first division" into the channel of practical counteraction to the residual principle of allocating resources for the development of the social sphere.

Among the supporters of S. S. Shatalin include E. T. Gaidar, G. Kh. Popov, A. B. Chubais and others, in whose writings the "shatalinsky" concept was directly continued. As a result, an entire methodological system was created, which served as the scientific (instrumental) basis for the transformation of the prevailing Soviet socialist ideology of the formation and functioning of the mechanism of state power, the real practice of distributing power

resources, the content of party program documents, and changes in the political regime in the USSR.

The fifth, modern post-Marxist (pluralistic) stage in the formation of ideas about the category of the mechanism of state power has been operating since the end of the 90s. XX century Until now. We agree with the opinion of E. A. Gromova that the analysis of pluralism in the field of scientific knowledge is the most fruitful in domestic scientific circles of recent years. Moreover, the content of the concept of “pluralism” is concretized when it is understood as an attitude, a principle according to which there are several mutually exclusive, but equally true answers to each significant question [18]. Separate methodological guidelines of the indicated approach are found in the works

of E.T. Borodin, M.G. Zelentsova, V.A. Lektersky, G.V. Platonov, L.G. Chervonna, V.F. Shapovalov and others.

On the basis of a pluralistic scientific vision, a whole series of modern scientific directions of studying the mechanism of state power has been formed, among which libertarian, teleological, behaviorist, psychological, conflictological and structural-functional concepts are distinguished.

The libertarian legal concept of the mechanism of state power, developed by V.S. Nersesyants in the 70-90s XX century.

Today is a separate area in Russian legal science, it is associated with a special type of understanding of law (positivistic theory of law) and suggests that state power in any form is associated with its expression in legal norms and the practice of their implementation. In this context, the design of the mechanism of state power and its basic elements is interpreted as a realized norm and is found, for example, in the design of a system for the separation of power into branches, the distribution of power, and the balance of the main elements of the mechanism. Representatives of the concept are N.V. Varlamova, E.A. Zorchenko, V.V. Lapaeva, V.A. Chetvernin and others.

The teleological (target) concept of the mechanism of state power is reflected in the works of O.E. Baksansky, V.P. Vizgin, P.P. Gaidenko, P.S. Gurevich, R.S. Karpinsky, and interprets the mechanism of state authorities from the perspective of an instrument to achieve their goals. Consequently, the mechanism of state power is intended to obtain the intended results of interest of politically active groups.

Behavioral theory deduces the “extract” of power from the characteristics of human behavior, in which some people command and others obey. The basis of human behavior is the desire (will) for power. Political power consists of individual aspirations for power as a balance, balance of political forces (G. Lassuel). Imbalance leads to crises in society. The concept under consideration is being developed by G. A. Arbatova, F. M. Burlatsky, N. M. Keizerov, D. A. Kerimov and others. The scientific direction characterizes the specifics of the mechanism of state power through the prism of the peculiarities of human behavior, in which society is divided into communicative and recipient social groups, and the behavior of these groups is based on the desire for power, consisting of individual aspirations for power, their balance and balance of political forces.

The psychoanalytic concept of the mechanism of state power (Yu.Ya. Baskin, D.I. Lukovskaya,

A.V. Polyakov, I.F. Rakitskaya and others) involves considering state power as a motive, the source of power, which is located in sphere of the unconscious. The psychoanalytic concept of the mechanism of state power interprets the desire for power as a manifestation (sublimation) of suppressed, mainly sexual, attraction or psychological energy in general.

The conflictological concept of the mechanism of state power (A.A. Konev, P.A. Lupinskaya, P.N. Panchenko, V.S. Ustinov and others) explains the nature of state power through the attitude of the domination of some groups and the subordination of others on the basis of the previous and ongoing conflict between and within these groups. The nature of this domination is due to economic inequality, attitude to property. Ownership of property provides the ruling class with the opportunity to subordinate economically dependent classes to their will and use the mechanism of state power to maintain and strengthen their dominant position.

## CONCLUSIONS.

The considered stages and methodological approaches to the study of state power mechanisms allow us to know and evaluate the genesis of the object in question in the relevant sections of Russian sociological, political and legal science, the evolution of formation as a result of modernization of the epistemological search and creative understanding of the scientific and theoretical material, methodological tools of science.

There is an opportunity to generalize the experience of various branches of the humanities, to reveal the involvement of the knowing interest of various researchers in the historically established dynamic structures of power, and also to begin to improve modern approaches to scientific research and improve the mechanisms of state power themselves.

It is impossible to reduce the epistemological function of science only to an inductive, synergetic knowledge of the mechanisms of state power. Nevertheless, the arithmetic method of synthesizing scientific arguments confirming the key objective features of the phenomenon under consideration provides an appropriate empirical and theoretical level of the proposed study.

As a result, we substantiated and proposed a new periodization of the evolutionary stages of scientific concepts, revealing the nature of the mechanism of state power.

The evolutionary stages of the scientific concepts themselves correspond to the evolutionary stages of the methodology of scientific knowledge of the mechanism of power. Accordingly, at the junction of this interaction, through the assertion of the unity of ontology, axiology and estology, we can fix and qualitatively study the connection between the methodology of science and the methodology of actual (modern) state building.

Conflict of interest.

The authors confirm the absence of a conflict of interest.

#### REFERENCES.

1. Isaev M. A. (2004) The mechanism of state power in the countries of Scandinavia. Constitutional and legal aspects: dis Dr. jur. sciences. Moscow, 371 p.
2. Gringmut V. A. (1906) The leadership of the Black Hundred monarchist // Moscow Gazette. June 3rd.
3. Stepanov A. D. (2015) "The hero of thought and deed." Vladimir A. Gringmut (1851-1907) // Right Russia. Biography of the leaders of the monarchist movement of the beginning of the XX century / comp. A.A. Ivanov, A.D. Stepanov. St. Petersburg: Royal business. 184 p.
4. Stepanov A. D. (1965) State Council during the revolution of 1905-1907: dis. ... cand. East. sciences. Moscow. 350 p.
5. Gringmut V.A. (1908) Notebook of Professor Barrikadov. Moscow: Russian printing house. 107 p.
6. Gringmut V.A. (1907) Russians and Jews in our revolution. Moscow: Fidelity. 17 p.
7. Ostretsov V. M. (1991) Black Hundred and Red Hundred. Moscow: Military Publishing. 48 p.
8. Gringmut V. A. (2008) Unite, Russian people! / Comp. A. D. Stepanova; open ed. O.A. Platonov. Moscow: Institute of Russian Civilization. 544 p.
9. Marx K., Engels F. Selected Works. In 3 volumes T. 3. Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1986. 639 p.
10. Letter from K. Marx to I. Weidemeyer (March 5, 1852) // Marx, K., Engels F. Works. Ed. 2nd.
11. 28. Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1962. 814 p.
12. Fedorov I. A. (1984) Formation of the category system of scientific communism in the works of
13. K. Marx and F. Engels (1843-1847): dis cand. philosopher. sciences. Leningrad. 211 p.
14. Leonov S. V. (1998) Creation of Soviet statehood: theory and practice. 1917-1922: dis Dr. historian. sciences. Moscow. 483 p.
15. Bernstein E. (1906) Classes and class struggle. Moscow: Publishing House V.D. Karchagin. 21 p.
16. Plekhanov G.V. (1949) On the development of a monistic view of history. Moscow: State Political Publishing House. 335 p.
17. Lenin V. I. Complete works. Ed. 5th. T.33. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1974. 428 p.

18. Knock P. I. (1922) Notes on the class theory of law // Soviet Law. No. 3. S. 3-
18. Gromova E.A. (2007) Social pluralism as an object of philosophical research:  
dis cand.
20. philosopher sciences. Volgograd. 143 p.